the claimed combination of features. Further, Winkler fails to overcome the deficiencies of Henderson.

More specifically, the present application was filed on December 7, 2001, claiming priority to Korean Patent Application No. 79700/2000 filed in Korea on December 7, 2000. A certified translation of the Korean Priority Document is filed herewith in order to effectuate the priority claim. As the December 7, 2000 filing date of the Korean Priority document clearly antedates the April 30, 2001 filing date of the Winkler reference, it is respectfully submitted that Winkler is not a proper reference, and thus, isn't properly combined with Henderson.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is allowable over the applied combination, and thus, the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Henderson and Winkler should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 8-10 and 13 are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejects claims 2-4, 14-15, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Henderson and Winkler in view of Eghtesadi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,982,904 (hereinafter "Eghtesadi"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As acknowledged by the Examiner in the remarks regarding independent claim 4, Henderson neither discloses nor suggests each of the features recited in independent claim 4, nor the claimed combination of features. Further, as set forth above, Winkler is not a proper

reference, and thus is improperly combined with Henderson. Further, Eghtesadi fails to overcome the deficiencies of Henderson and Winkler. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 4 is allowable over the applied combination, and thus the rejection of independent claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Henderson, Winkler, and Eghtesadi should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 14-15 and 18 are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 4, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

Further, dependent claims 2-3 are allowable over Henderson and Winkler at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features. Further, Eghtesadi fails to overcome the deficiencies of Henderson and Winkler. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-3 are allowable over the applied combination, and thus the rejection of claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Henderson, Winkler, and Eghtesadi should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 5-7 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Henderson and Winkler in view of Tuoriniemi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,978,689 (hereinafter "Tuoriniemi"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As acknowledged by the Examiner in the remarks regarding independent claim 5, Henderson neither discloses nor suggests each of the features recited in is independent claim 5, nor the claim combination of features. Further, as set forth above, Winkler is not a proper reference, and thus is improperly combined with Henderson. Further, Tuoriniemi fails to

overcome the deficiencies of Henderson and Winkler. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 5 is allowable over the applied combination, and thus, the rejection of independent claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Henderson, Winkler, and Tuoriniemi should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 6-7 are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 5, from which they depend, as well as for their added features.

Dependent claims 11-12 are allowable over Henderson and Winkler at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features. Further, Tuoriniemi fails to overcome the deficiencies of Henderson and Winkler. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11-12 are allowable over the applied combination, and thus the rejection of claims 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Henderson, Winkler, and Touriniemi should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Henderson, Winkler, Eghtesadi, and Tuoriniemi. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 16-17 are allowable over Henderson, Winkler, and Eghtesadi at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 4, from which they depend, as well as for their added features. Further, Tuoriniemi fails to overcome the deficiencies of Henderson, Winkler, and Eghtesadi. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 16-17 are allowable over the applied combination, and thus, the rejection of claims 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Henderson, Winkler, Eghtesadi, and Tuoriniemi should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, **IOANNA K. MASON**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted, FLESHNER & KIM, LLP

Carol L. Druzbick Registration No. 40,287

Leanna V. Mason

Joanna K. Mason Registration No. 56,408

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200

 $703\ 766\text{-}3701\ \text{DYK:CLD:JKM/}$ whitlg

Date: October 12, 2005 Q:\Documents\2000-235\70898

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610